309.12
D496w

WELFARE FEDERATIONS

By EDWARD T. DEVINE

How Not to Do It: Philadelphia
The Mid-West Spirit: Louisville
Where It Works: Cleveland and Detroit
The National Agencies: General Considerations

REPRINTED FROM
The SURVEY
112 E. 19 St., New York

PRICE 50 CENTS

COPYRIGHT 1921 BY
SURVEY ASSOCIATES, INC.

309.12
D436w
SOL

I

HOW NOT TO DO IT: PHILADELPHIA

Reid
IIJL23

THE federation of social agencies, on the general plan of the Cleveland Welfare Federation with its allied community fund, is going on apace. Philadelphia, on the initiative of the Chamber of Commerce, has inaugurated a plan of a different kind, in which the social agencies are not so much participants as beneficiaries, whether willing or reluctant. Pittsburgh has taken the matter up on the same initiative but is not committed to the same plan. New Orleans, where it was tried and abandoned, is again in the throes of federation. Harrisburg has established a federation. Seattle has announced a community chest which at the moment of its birth may prove to be a changeling, a real federation of social agencies. Tacoma is starting contemporaneously a community chest and a council of social agencies and the twins may have Siamese ligaments.

Stechert
1923

The rapidity of this spread of the movement for a kind of federation which includes among other features the financial function even when this is not the sole or dominating purpose is the more remarkable because there is no organized propaganda behind it, and because it has been in the face of an adverse report issued four years ago by the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work. The federations have a somewhat informal gathering from time to time, which is inaptly known as the American Association for Community Organization. While the name of this loose conference is obviously a misnomer, it is only fair to recognize

P 6995

that it is hard to find any designation in social organization which is not a misnomer.

Community organization is a complex process whose varied aspects—religious, philanthropic, educational, economic—have varying degrees of importance according to the point of view. The chamber of commerce really seems to many people an ideal form of community organization. Its members support the colleges, churches, and philanthropies. Why should they not control them? Or, as it would be more likely to be expressed, why should they continue to support agencies which do not conduct their affairs in a business-like and sensible way? In a quite different world, whose inhabitants in the mass are not entirely unknown to business men, a central trades and labor council may appear to be the normal method of bringing together all whose views and preferences need to be considered seriously. A church federation, again, may fill the whole horizon; or a community council of which the public school building is the physical center.

Among these naive and divisive views we must class that which regards a council of social agencies as an ideal plan of community organization provided it is "functional," by which appears to be meant that it does not function in the raising of funds, but may in almost any other direction, especially in the verbal exchange of views. After visiting nearly all of the cities in which there are flourishing federations, East, West and South, including several, like St. Louis and Chicago, in which there are councils but no financial federations, and others, like Louisville and Milwaukee, in which there are councils financed by, but otherwise independent of their financial federations, I am unable to share the preference for "functional," i. e., non-financial, federations, and I am strongly of the opinion that social workers are missing a great opportunity if they do not insist on taking a very

active and whole-hearted part in the kind of federation which appeals to representative business and civic bodies because it recognizes that common finance is one of the surest and most legitimate means of encouraging the union of the philanthropic and civic agencies in a community program.

The fact appears to be that financial co-operation is one of the very best ways to accomplish the constructive educational results for which any council would be created. As Robert E. Lewis, the general secretary of the Y. M. C. A. in Cleveland, has said:

> The acid test of cooperation is the use of money. It means very little to hear papers in conference and to vote platonic resolutions. Unless you cooperate financially, talk of cooperation means very little. But when associations and welfare institutions in a city with every sort of affiliation and control are willing to budget in the open, welcome public audit, shape their work in a unified way and stimulate one another to frank and full efficiency, it means something.

The astounding opinion has been expressed in the opposition to financial federation that the welfare institutions have nothing in common to justify their common appeal; that it is no easier for them to engage in common publicity than it would be to advertise at once a butcher shop, a lawyer's office and a bank. If this is so, the National Conference of Social Work is evidently a mistake. The Russell Sage Foundation in its several departments is striving for incompatible ends. The SURVEY has no natural constituency. Poverty, disease, crime, ignorance have no common origins or remedies. The sense of community which have been awakening should be put to sleep. We may preach co-operation but all the time must expect in our hearts that those to whom we preach will continue to regard one another with only that degree of cordiality which a butcher shop naturally feels for a lawyer's office or a bank for a grocery.

This is not the spirit of a genuine welfare federation. Conferences held under the auspices of a council which is also raising money, for that very reason have more vitality. Delegates take their responsibilities more seriously. Standing committees know that there is driving power behind their deliberations. Business men treat their conclusions with more respect.

An alliance of the civic and charitable associations to promote their common ends and to provide common services is obviously a very different thing from an independently organized and managed "community chest," even though the latter may be called, as in Philadelphia, a "welfare federation." In Baltimore the more accurately descriptive term alliance is used. In Toronto it is called Federation for Community Service. In Cleveland the Welfare Federation has a central body consisting of two representatives from each agency, not more than one to be a paid employe, and a board of trustees, one-third of whose members are elected each year and not more than one-third to be paid officials of financially participating agencies. The Detroit Community Union has a general council made up of two representatives from each agency, one a professional executive and one a board member. This general council elects the officers and a board of directors. In Cleveland and in Detroit the actual money raising is done by a distinct but closely allied body known as the "Community Fund."

These details are mentioned merely to indicate that in these cities and in many others having councils or alliances or unions or federations which both raise money and perform other functions natural to a council of social agencies, the plan of organization permits, and indeed encourages, actual control of the raising and apportioning of funds by representatives of the agencies in whose names and in whose interests

the appeals are made. They embody the principle of representative democracy. They embody the principle that the paid executives of charitable societies are presumably leaders and experts whose voices may properly be heard on the board of trustees of any federation which they create or which is in their interest. They embody also the principle of building on historical foundations. They do not replace existing institutions by a new super-institution, but they unite or ally the existing institutions in a common effort to care more intelligently for those who are in need, to check the destructive influences, and to promote the healing and stimulating forces.

It may seem like straining at a minor point, like that foolish contending for forms of government which the poet condemns, to insist on the inherent advantages of participation in actual control by the agencies, especially since the same people are very likely to be found in positions of responsibility whether chosen by a small group of self-appointed guardians or democratically elected and nominally representing some useful existing society. But even in the political field, this indifference to the forms of democracy is now found to be rather dangerous policy. The autocrats are no longer certain to be representatives of the traditional culture, the established church, vested interests. They may be very drastic innovators. On the educational and philanthropic rafts also the democratic principle may prove to be the only safe anchor for the valuable cargoes which have come down to us on the rivers of time. If there are rapids below us the willing hands of many may be more certain reliance than the superior traditions of the few. If we are to have federated financing —and this appears to be the pronounced tendency—it is not a matter of indifference, and not solely a matter of administration, whether it is to be under the direction of the agencies which are to spend it; whether they are to remain strong,

independent and vigorous through association, or are to become dependent, subordinate to a small group of financiers, living by suffrance, cut off from living contact with their sources of nourishment.

The absurdities and weaknesses of the traditional non-federated methods of financing social agencies are undeniable. They have been exposed frequently, most conclusively perhaps by the recent study in Philadelphia. It there appeared that about 2½ per cent of the city's population are financing the general non-sectarian agencies—or perhaps 5 per cent, if we include the Jewish Agencies (which have their own federation) and others not counted in the 234 agencies studied. There are too few large givers among the wealthy and there are altogether too many who in spite of all the urgent appeals are never directly asked to share in the satisfactions and responsibilities of social work. Essential agencies are inadequately supported; and their support is from an absurdly small number of people. Conversely, those who do give are closely limited in the range of their sympathies, as indicated by the number of agencies to which they contribute.

All this is told with frankness and convincing detail in the Philadelphia report. It puts the social agencies on the defensive at least, for it is no more creditable to have disorganization, haphazard income, chaotic competition for gifts, erratic personal lavishness alternating with indifference, in the financing of the charitable societies, than it is to leave individual families who need help to spasmodic, disorganized almsgiving. If there is any merit in the arguments for organized charity in the relief and prevention of individual distress, there is merit in the larger demand for community organization to meet the social needs as a whole. New York

and Chicago are not models to be followed but overgrown examples of stupidity and provincialism.

It does not follow that the particular plan adopted in Philadelphia and in other cities which have a "community chest" is the best way of meeting those needs. Indeed, the constitution adopted for the new Welfare Federation of Philadelphia appears to have been also a changeling in the cradle but with the change, so to speak, in the opposite direction from that which may have taken place in Seattle. In other words, a "welfare federation" has become a close corporation of givers, mainly of large givers; while in Seattle a "community chest," having its origin in a desire of givers to be free from the annoyances of many "drives," seems to be developing into a real federation of social agencies for common purposes, including the raising of funds. In Pittsburgh and in many other cities the issue hangs in the balance. Will the Chamber of Commerce create merely a community chest in which social agencies have no other responsibility than to get all the revenue they can, or will there be created by co-operative effort a federation of agencies responsible for surveying the needs of the city, co-ordinating its social activities, creating new ones as required, educating public opinion, pooling their resources of money and good-will in a united frontal attack on all the destructive forces of evil, in a generous attempt to give the maximum aid to those who need it?

In Philadelphia the conditions would seem to be exceptionally favorable for a co-operative federation. In no other city has more progress been made in the practical working out of co-operative arrangements among the social agencies. Their social service exchange is financially supported by the associations which use it. Their "intake committee" has had an extraordinary and lasting influence. Executives and staffs have been good neighbors and this good feeling has reached

the point of effective influence on the daily activities of the societies, especially of the general relief societies and those which are interested in children and in the care of the sick.

The Philadelphia Welfare Federation was created at a meeting of citizens and consists of (a) its financial contributors, (b) representatives, (c) board of trustees and (d) council of social agencies. The representatives include a few ex-officio members and 100 persons elected at the organization meeting. Their principal duty is to elect the board of trustees. After its first year, representatives are to be elected by the financial contributors. It would be difficult to devise a plan which would more surely secure complete control in the hands of the directing group if this is desired, as it probably is not. The organization meeting was of course attended by those who were invited. Even so, however, it was not entrusted with the task of choosing the trustees. The process of indirect election which has been so brilliantly successful in eliminating democracy from American political parties, and which has lent itself so neatly to communist dictatorship in Russia, is preferred to any plan which gives direct control either to givers or to the agencies. The board of trustees, thus chosen by "representatives" who are in turn chosen by a self-constituted gathering of contributors, exercises executive powers, conducts the business, holds and controls the property, and apportions and disburses the funds of the federation. It determines the qualifications of applicants for financial assistance and prescribes the conditions on which it shall be granted. Other federations which are on the representative system may also elect their trustees indirectly but the delegates to the general meeting in those cases are chosen by the agencies.

It may be objected that the constitution of the federation provides for a council of social agencies and that this may

supply the democratic element which had seemed lacking. Quite true. There is to be a council consisting of one delegate from each association approved by the board of trustees. It may discuss, devise, and recommend. It is its duty to furnish information and advice upon request of the representatives or the trustees. It even nominates 20 per cent, not of the trustees, but of the representatives who are to elect the trustees, and the contributors are expected to elect these nominees unless "the said contributors for reasons satisfactory to themselves shall decide otherwise."

No one who "receives pecuniary compensation from any social agency or association" is eligible to the board of trustees. That is to say, no one who is professionally engaged in social work is competent to sit on the board of managers of the welfare federation of the city. What would be said of a federation for the financing of the higher institutions of learning of the board of managers of which no university president was eligible; or of a combination of banks or railways in which all paid officials were ineligible? Would it not be to deprive the united effort in either case of its natural leadership? With all due respect to the big men who have created the welfare federation and who financed the war appeals, are not the natural leaders in the welfare work of Philadelphia to be found among the executives of its social agencies? Are not Prentice Murphy, Karl de Schweinitz, Edwin Solenberger, Kenneth Pray, Anna Pratt and Katherine Tucker and their like among the people who should be on the board of managers of any welfare federation if it is to perform any such functions as its constitution announces: the promotion, co-ordination and financial assistance of associations for civic and charitable work, the elimination of waste in effort and expenditure, and the scientific applica-

tion to social conditions of principles, plans and methods approved by study and experience?

The inauguration of the plan in Philadelphia has not been made conditional upon any official action by "the associations for civic and charitable work." They appear to have nothing to do except to qualify as beneficiaries and if approved by the board of trustees to choose a delegate at a convenient time to serve on the council. They will be expected in due course to submit their budgets, with such supporting data as the trustees may demand.

The welfare federation, as conceived and brought to fruition in Philadelphia, may prove to be a solution for the particular evils which the investigation of the Chamber of Commerce brought to light. It may and probably will increase the number of givers, broaden the support of the social agencies, widen the interest of individual givers, encourage larger donations by those who have a large surplus, eliminate some waste, and enable the approved societies to make their plans with greater confidence that the income required to carry them out will be supplied. These results, if they are achieved, will be important. The council of social agencies, notwithstanding its purely advisory character, notwithstanding that its very membership depends on the approval of another body to which the executive officers of its members are not eligible, may become, as the promoters of the welfare federation hope that it will, a very dynamic and integral part of the scheme. It may even do as well as any of the existing councils of social agencies. If it has at its disposal the services of a qualified paid secretary and staff its usefulness may be very great. The federation has secured as its executive Sherman C. Kingsley, formerly director of the Cleveland Welfare Federation, a leader of proved statesmanship and democratic spirit. This appointment may reasonably be con-

sidered conclusive evidence that the attitude of the promoters of the Philadelphia Federation is not clearly reflected in their formal organization. It may be predicted that the essentially undemocratic character of the original constitution will be modified in due time, either expressly or tacitly.

The important thing is that in the interest of clear thinking the Philadelphia plan should be understood as it is and that from its success or failure no unwarranted inferences should be drawn in regard to the general movement for federation. It is an attempt by an influential and substantial group of citizens to bring order out of chaos, to offer a plan which the associations of civic and charitable work will be bound by self-interest to accept, under which they will turn over to this group the raising of their budgets in common, on condition that they will allow this self-constituted, however widely representative, group through its board of directors to "prescribe the conditions." Any particular federation of social agencies may be defective or ineffective. But those who are striving for a council which shall be representative, inclusive, and effective are headed in the right direction. A chamber of commerce which is earnestly and open-mindedly studying the problem of community needs as a whole and the best way of meeting them is more to be praised than a family welfare society which stubbornly opposes the effort to find any such comprehensive plan, or the national body which refuses to submit its policies as far as they affect a particular locality to the common judgment of those who are concerned with the same problems in that locality.

A good life for the individual, a civic ideal for the city—nothing less should command the highest loyalty and enthusiasm of the citizen. The chamber of commerce cannot secure these things or even strive for them intelligently without the organized co-operation of churches, labor unions,

and other social agencies. It is a truism that each association to fulfill its ends needs the understanding and sympathy of the others. The difficulty is that those which are most flourishing, most dominant, most secure in the affection and loyalty of their own constituencies, are subject to the peculiar temptation of thinking that they can impose their own program as a preliminary condition of co-operation. They act like the Great Powers at the Paris Conference with their progressively diminishing council of ten and four and three, or rather, as the one great power is supposed to have been intending to act if the victory had gone the other way, and as the Third International of Moscow is acting in its relation with the Socialist parties of the world. That is not the kind of democracy which Lowell described as a society in which each may respect himself because he has first respected others. A democratic federation is not, of course, on all fours with the political state, but it resembles it in its detestation of privilege. Good ideas may come from humble sources.

II

THE MID-WEST SPIRIT: LOUISVILLE

THE apprehensions of those who saw a big-stick threat in the movement for financial federation on the initiative of chambers of commerce or other groups of financiers and business men had some theoretical basis. Open-minded observation of the operation of the federations in which funds are raised jointly will be likely to convince the observer that the objections are academic and that the spirit of control is in fact conspicuously absent. This may be in part because of their geographical location. The Middle West is the stronghold of old-fashioned American democracy, and the congenial habitat of the federation idea thus far is there.

With a few exceptions, the flourishing federations are to be found between the Canadian border and the Ohio, between the Niagara and the Missouri. Until the recent development in Philadelphia, no city of more than a million had created a general financial federation, although Jewish institutions have found the principle applicable even in the larger cities. Some of the most extraordinary results have indeed been secured in towns of very moderate size. Elyria, Ohio, for example, with a population of only twenty-four thousand, claims to have been the first city to adopt the community chest plan. Middletown, another Ohio town of the same size as Elyria, but at the other end of the state, has a remarkable achievement to record. Over a million dollars was raised there by the Middletown Chamber of Commerce

for a civic fund from nine thousand contributors, an average of about two givers from each family in town. Not all of this was for current work and half of it came from the large industrial establishments. These are cited merely as interesting variations, but in fact variation is almost the only characteristic which can be asserted with confidence of the entire movement. Nothing could be more absurd than to represent it as an effort to impose a rigidly uniform type of money raising on all communities.

By far the best answer that I have heard to the apprehension that federations may exercise some kind of indirect or subtle control over the policies of the institutions comes from Father Le Blond, the director of Catholic Charities in Cleveland. He had mentioned in conversation some apprehensions which he had at the beginning but which had been wholly laid at rest by experience. I then asked him whether he thought there was any ground for the apprehension which I had frequently heard expressed, that, even if federations were entirely successful financially, and even if the managers and budget committees had every desire to be fair and just in their dealings, nevertheless there might be some degree of unconscious control by the money-raising and appropriating body over the internal policies, the actual operations of the various agencies. His reply was quick and wholly unexpected. "Yes," he said, "I think there is some probability of that and I think it is a very good thing." Further discussion made it clear that this extraordinary clergyman saw the full implications of his remark, and that he meant just what he said. His view is of course based on the assumption that the money-raising agency is a federation, really representing the money-spending agencies. What it comes to then is simply that the whole is greater and probably better than the part; that the community as a whole

corrects the undue provincialism or excessive institutionalism of a particular agency. It is just the unconscious pressure which the sense of the common welfare exercises under normal conditions over the idiosyncracies of individuals. Variations are welcome but extreme or erratic deviations make the neighbors uncomfortable, and this is not a matter for regret but for congratulation. Control must not of course be arbitrary or unlimited but that degree of influence which the social agencies of the community as a whole may exercise through federation on the Y. M. C. A., the Red Cross, the Associated Charities, or a Catholic, Jewish or Protestant hospital, is in the interests of progress and a rational conservatism.

In the summary report of the meeting of the federations in New Orleans a year ago, it is recorded that "it was generally agreed that the democratic form of organization is desirable and that at least the member agencies and the givers should be represented on the governing board." Opinions differed as to whether the chambers of commerce should have representatives. The sentiment of those present was in favor of "an annual campaign" with, however, the greatest attention to the preliminary work and to the organizing of personnel, and inspiring the necessary enthusiasm and sense of responsibility. The "quota" idea should not be carried in actual solicitation to the point of an insistence which might cause resentment. It was agreed that local partnerships and firms should be exempt from solicitation, emphasis being placed on individual gifts. There was much difference of opinion as to the advisability and possibility of securing gifts from corporations with absentee ownership. While it was generally felt that such corporations had an obligation to the communities in which they do business, sufficient knowledge was not available as to the degree of success

in obtaining such gifts and as to the feeling of the corporations themselves to justify any final conclusion. It was generally agreed that the support of industrial (i. e., labor) groups should be sought and that labor should be brought to participate and to feel that the organization is a community affair. House to house canvass by volunteer solicitors was favored, with assignment of districts for the encouragement of fair competition and with careful arrangements to avoid irritation from unavoidable duplication because of solicitation according to business and industrial divisions.

A professional campaign manager is not usually employed, the recent experience in Minneapolis where the full amount desired was not obtained being an exception which seems not to disprove the soundness of the policy. Campaign cost has in many instances been kept below 1 per cent and has been met by interest on deposits. Educational work must be carried on the year round to supplement the campaigns. Designation of particular agencies by givers is not generally encouraged, but in Cincinnati the council has adopted the policy of encouraging if not practically urging designations and about 85 per cent of its contributions are "designated."

The policy of appointing "functional committees" composed largely of laymen was approved. Their purpose is to bring the agencies into closer relationship with one another, to establish standards, and gradually to work out a well defined and co-ordinated community program.

The budget committee, which is the pivot of federation, is constituted differently in different cities. In Cleveland the committee consists of thirty-five persons appointed by the president of the federation with the approval of the trustees. In Grand Rapids the budget committee consists of fifteen members, seven of whom are elected by the agencies, seven

by the contributors and one by the city Association of Commerce. The *sine qua non* of a successful federation is a competent, well organized, active budget committee. Careful study and scrutiny of the individual budgets is essential. Fair dealing and mutual confidence are insured by working out final budgets in round table discussion and not by arbitrary and unexplained final action on the part of a budget committee. Care should be exercised to prevent "log rolling," but it was the general experience that the member organizations are usually sincere in the preparation of their budgets and reasonable in accepting criticism of them.

These conclusions are presented as indicative of the underlying spirit of the federations as they appear at work in the Middle West and elsewhere. They are not a product of the war chests—although in several places the success of the war drives gave an impetus to the federation plan. Generally speaking, it may be said that under the federation plan much larger funds have been raised than were collected by the agencies acting independently.

Their remarkable financial success has been discounted in some quarters by the irrelevant and fallacious observation that they have not been able to get away from the "drive" method and that "drives" are becoming unpopular. It is predicted that as we get farther away from the war the "drive," i. e., the united intensive financial campaign in which all are asked to give once in the year but to give enough for all, will become increasingly unpopular. This seems likely to prove a hasty prediction. The raising of money may be made educational, as those who favor separate and numerous appeals themselves insist; and the educational publicity of the federations compares very favorably thus far with the numerous separate appeals. This publicity moreover is not limited to the campaign week or to financial needs. The strongest

argument in favor of federation is precisely the remarkable increase in the amount of intelligent public discussion to which it gives rise. The columns of the newspapers, public meetings, and private conversation all bear evidence to this; but the final test is the number of well informed citizens who show that they take an interest in the public and private welfare activities. Any individual observer may easily be misled in such comparisons, but for whatever it may be worth the writer records his own opinion that in this respect Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee and other federation cities compare most favorably with cities of similar rank in which federation has not taken place.

Hostile critics of federation are always especially quick to point out any failure to secure from a joint campaign the full amount that the managers have set for their goal in that particular campaign. It is said that since the federation is financial, it must succeed at this point or it is a complete failure. This is obviously unfair even in the case of a "community chest." The comparison should obviously be with the amounts raised prior to federation; or better, if there is any basis for estimate, with the amounts which could be raised by independent appeals. There may be general conditions which affect the giving capacity or disposition which are wholly independent of the method of appeal. Minneapolis failed to raise the full amount for which the council asked for the present year largely because the campaign, planned of course long in advance, happened to coincide with a calamitous fall in the price of wheat. The question is whether separate appeals would have done better. All campaigns this year will suffer from the general industrial depression. The question is which will suffer more, the agencies which are in federations or those which are not. There is no peculiar and exclusive obligation on federations

to succeed in their efforts. That obligation rests equally on all welfare agencies. They must raise the money which they require or else abandon or restrict their work. St. Louis has no federation but its Provident Association is finding it exceedingly difficult to raise its budget. New York has no federation but the Charity Organization Society of New York has announced the closing of its Bronx district office. I have yet to hear of any similar confession of failure in a federation city.

Louisville, a city of a little less than a quarter of a million, may be taken as an instructive example of the kind of federation which is neither limited to a "community chest" nor yet deprived of the backbone which the financial function seems to supply.

The Louisville Board of Trade, which corresponds with the chamber of commerce in many cities, has had for several years a Charities Endorsement Committee. In Cleveland also and in some other cities the endorsement plan preceded federation, and in several cities, as in Memphis and Des Moines, it is still the chambers of commerce themselves that undertake through special departments to prevent fraudulent soliciting and other recognized abuses by this and other means. When the Welfare League, which is now in its third year, was created in Louisville, primarily as a federation for the raising of funds, the Charities Endorsement Committee was continued, where it was already located, in the Board of Trade. It was provided that no agency should be eligible for membership in the league which did not have the endorsement of the Board of Trade's committee, but it did not follow that all of the endorsed agencies would care to join the league. The separation of these two functions, in fact as well as in name, in this respect simplified the task of the league. The latter has no occasion to make enemies by

refusing admission to any charitable institution which desires to join. The league may devote itself wholly to the specific task of acquainting the community with the purposes and needs of its constituent members and securing the funds which they require.

The thirty-one agencies in the league have budgets for 1921 amounting to $536,012, of which there had to be raised by gifts $344,009. In addition to this, the Welfare League in the year 1920 had a deficit of $51,561, incurred because it tried to get along without a financial campaign. This made a total of $395,570 to be raised in contributions for 1921. By May 15, $336,000 of this had been secured, leaving $60,000 still to be found. By that time, however, it had been clearly demonstrated that through the cordial co-operation of the member organizations in keeping down their expenses at least $20,000 less than had been estimated would be required to run the organizations during 1921, so that their current expenses for the year will not be more than $324,000 in contributions. This full sum has already been subscribed, and $12,000 toward clearing off the deficit. Officers of the Welfare League declare that they are hopeful of cutting the deficit in two in 1921, and expect to clear it off entirely in the campaign for 1922, which has been set for the week of November 15-22.

The league publishes an exceptionally interesting booklet of eighty-eight pages. The following paragraphs deal with its program for the year ahead:

> During the year we shall work for the development of all possible economies in the leagued organizations, through promoting the increased use of the Central Purchasing Bureau and of the Social Service Exchange; through a study of dietaries with a view to getting the maximum food value for the least expenditure; and through an attempt to standardize all

other supplies so far as possible, to get the best article for a given purpose at the least cost.

We shall attempt to make our work as effective as possible, through developing additional trained workers; through applying the highest possible standards of service to all our work; through careful cooperation on individual cases of need by all agencies concerned; and through cooperative action on community problems by means of the Community Council's "functional committees."

We shall attempt so far as possible to lessen the number of people who require aid, through a disease-prevention and health-promotion campaign to be carried on by the Louisville Anti-Tuberculosis Association, now released from the burden of supporting Hazelwood Sanitorium; through the extension of the Public Health Nursing Association's service on a pay basis to families above the poverty line; through promoting the use of the Psychological Clinic in detecting the feeble-minded; through helping to keep in school until properly trained, children who otherwise would go to work before their time and never become anything but unskilled, low-paid workers; through encouraging our settlements and other agencies which build sturdy, self-reliant citizenship in people who have not yet come to need charity or become delinquent; and through encouraging people who have not yet come to actual need, and in whose cases further difficulties can be avoided by prompt service, to avail themselves of the advice on domestic problems offered by such "case-work" agencies as the Associated Charities.

Just as soon as anything above the funds needed for carrying on the leagued organizations on their present basis can be raised, we should extend to the borders of Jefferson County the services of the Associated Charities, the Public Health Nursing Association and the Children's Protective Association.

We should as soon as possible provide also an agency for the care, training and vocational placement of crippled and otherwise physically handicapped people.

We should develop a children's bureau, to serve all the children's institutions in the city. It should ascertain the full facts concerning all applicants for admission to these institutions; keep in touch with their parents or guardians, if any, while they are in these institutions; find family homes in which these children may be boarded out or placed for adoption as soon as possible . . . and supervise these family homes.

We should provide for unmarried colored mothers institutional care of the same order as that now provided by the Sal-

vation Army Susan Speed Davis Home and Hospital for white mothers.

The league includes Jewish as well as Catholic and Protestant agencies. Unlike Cleveland, it does not include the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., and other national agencies, or the funds for foreign relief; and there are several local agencies which for one reason or another prefer to remain outside the movement. Some of them may think that they do better financially as free lances. More often, however, it is because they are apprehensive that transferring the responsibility for raising funds will mean that kind of control by the money raisers—that limitation on their own sovereignty—which we have already discussed.

From the financial point of view this is not a serious handicap to the league or its members, but from the point of view of community organization it presents a situation which has been met by the creation of a larger and distinct Community Council. In this body practically all of the civic and charitable agencies, whether members of the league or not, are welcome and are participating. It is financed by the league, just as its other constituent members are, and is thus free of the necessity of asking dues or contributions. This council conducts certain service departments—a confidential exchange, a psychological clinic, and a central purchasing bureau. It has also numerous standing committees: as for example, on child welfare, family welfare, neighborhood work, health, housing and city planning, mental hygiene, recreation, social hygiene, and county welfare problems (i. e., outside the city limits). In these committees, directors, officials, paid and volunteer workers in the numerous public and voluntary agencies, consider their common problems, exchange experience, investigate new or current needs, and in general promote the art of co-operation by practicing it.

Some of these committees may assume administrative duties, such as securing volunteer entertaining "talent" for orphanages, old folks' homes and hospitals, or the enactment of a new housing law. A committee like that on city planning may have its own paid secretary. Other committees will be content to recommend plans which existing agencies will undertake to carry out.

The point of chief interest for the present inquiry lies in the relation between the community council and the welfare league. Even in Louisville the impression seems to prevail that there is something anomalous—not quite orthodox and regular—in the historical sequence of the founding of these two bodies. The first attempt to create a council within the league itself was not successful. The present council appears to be working well. It succeeded in securing the passage of an improved housing law and has undertaken the ambitious task of working out a city planning program. Its secretary, R. A. Hoyer, believes that the ideal sequence is the reverse of that followed in Louisville; that a city should "begin with a non-financial federation or council and keep away from money raising until the various organizations have become acquainted and have learned to work together. Then the organizations that desire to raise money jointly can do so, coming together just as the organizations desiring to do child welfare work come together." In other words, "the money-raising function should be carried on under a budget committee which should be much like any other functional committee."

Although this sounds reasonable and is in accord with the procedure recommended by the highest authorities, there is very little in the actual experience of federation cities to support it. Minneapolis is one conspicuous example of the transformation of a "functional" council of social agencies

into a financial federation, or—if one prefers to put it that way—of the development alongside other "functions" of that of raising money by joint appeal. The earlier experience of the secretary of the Minneapolis Council, Otto W. Davis, lay in the field of family social work, improved housing, etc., and he naturally regards it as fundamental "that money raising should rest ultimately on the group which controls the money spending. Otherwise it would become necessary to educate each group separately and the results are less satisfactory because of the mutually exclusive lines of experience." He sees also, and in this he would have the support of the federations in general, that the agencies as a united group should "be closely related to the money-raising efforts" in order to secure "the most intelligent consideration of the pros and cons with relation to increases of budgets, the need of special studies, etc." Cincinnati's Council of Social Agencies also functioned in other directions for a year or two before assuming the joint raising of funds.

III

WHERE IT WORKS: CLEVELAND AND DETROIT

THE sixty federations which appear in the informal directory of the American Association for Community Organization include several which are very recent and others concerning which little information is available. Some of the stronger ones, like Milwaukee, Denver, Minneapolis and Baltimore, have had very instructive experiences. A few which have failed to profit by the experience of others and have assumed that social agencies may be financed by passing the hat have come to grief.

Because of the outstanding influence of the Cleveland Welfare Federation it will do no harm to recall some of the salient facts of its eight years' history and its present organization. This history is roughly divisible into two periods of about equal length—four years of the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy of which Whiting Williams was the executive, and four years of the Welfare Federation with Sherman C. Kingsley as director. The change of name and executive occurred shortly before America became involved in the World War. The earlier federation was primarily financial, laying stress however on the establishment of standards and co-operation. In the latter part of this period was created a Welfare Council, which had no funds at its disposal and did no active work on its own account, but held meetings to discuss policies and to clarify opinion, with a view to placing responsibility on particular private or public agencies for doing things which were neglected.

On the financial side this earlier federation achieved no very extraordinary results. Some of the important agencies like the Young Men's Christian Association did not join it. Some that did join were on the point of withdrawal because they could not see that it brought any substantial advantage. However it was making history in the movement for co-operation. It did promote mutual understanding. It cultivated the practice of thinking in terms of the community. The fact that in 1918 the seven great "morale-making agencies" of the war united in a successful appeal throughout the nation is directly due to the fact that Newton D. Baker was secretary of war; and that he came from Cleveland, where in strict continuation of the co-operative community habit of mind several of these very agencies had already united in their local appeal. To Mr. Williams and his associates in the Cleveland Federation in these four years belongs the credit of the pioneers, the distinction of having established the model before the United States went into the war and the war chests were created.

Opponents of financial federation often urge a "functional council" as a "first step" after they recognize that the sentiment in favor of real federation has become so strong that it cannot be ignored. Their hope is that the larger movement may thus be shelved. I do not of course suggest that there are not other and better reasons for councils of social agencies like those in Boston and Columbus. Surely it is significant that in Cleveland, where the experience now covers a longer period than in any other city except Denver, the early steps were in the path of financial federation and that they did lead in the right direction of co-operation for the general welfare and in later years to conspicuous financial success. It is fair to recall that a democratic federation must build itself from the materials at hand. The stream of asso-

ciated good-will cannot rise higher than its sources in the institutions and activities which the public spirit of the community is willing to maintain. The first settlements in Cleveland and the reorganization of the associated charities date from the beginning of the century. Federation has contributed cohesion to social action and to progressive thinking in terms of community welfare, but well established social agencies, a progressive chamber of commerce, and the political impetus of such leadership as that of Tom Johnson and Newton Baker are by no means unimportant elements in the success of federation.

The Cleveland Welfare Federation in 1917 absorbed the Welfare Council as well as the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy. It had plans for immediate expansion in the very directions which have since been carried out, but the war interfered with their immediate execution. A War Council representing the Red Cross, the Mayor's Defense Council and other interests came into being. The Welfare Federation was advised to make its usual appeal but not to compete in a too active campaign with the war causes and was assured, by a sort of gentlemen's agreement, that any deficit would be taken care of by the War Council. In accordance with this promise the Welfare Federation received from the war chest in 1917 $80,000; in 1918, $110,000, and in 1919, $186,000, a total of $376,000. In 1919 the community fund continued what was virtually the war chest and financed for 1920 the agencies in the Welfare Federation, the national agencies operating in Cleveland and the foreign relief agencies.

On May 1, 1920, the community fund was reorganized on a more permanent peace basis. Under the new plan the management of the community fund was vested in a board of forty members, twenty of whom were to be elected

by the existing community fund (war chest), sixteen by the Welfare Federation, two by the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, and two to be ex officio, viz., the mayor and the director of public welfare. After its first constitution the board was to elect half of its own members (ten each year for a two-year term) and the other half were to be chosen as above indicated. Inasmuch as the Welfare Federation and its constituent bodies were well represented in the existing community fund, and as the federation itself is a delegated, representative body, this obviously gives complete control of the entire money-raising function to the agencies in whose behalf the funds are raised.

The Welfare Federation, although it has thus transferred the conduct of the financial campaign to the community fund, which also raises the funds required for the Jewish Federation and for the national and foreign relief agencies, is not without direct financial responsibility even aside from the facts that its executive is also executive secretary of the community fund and that their permanent offices are common. It is the Welfare Federation whose budget committee passes upon the budgets of the agencies in the federation and also, at the request of the community fund, on some although not all of the additional appeals which are included in its campaign.

The affairs of the Cleveland Welfare Federation are managed by a general board composed of two representatives of each of the agencies in its membership. The paid executive of the association may be and is likely to be one of these two representatives and the president or some other members of the board the other. The general board elects a board of trustees of twenty-four members, eight each year for a three-year term. This board meets semi-monthly, appoints com-

mittees and directs the work of the federation through the director and his staff.

The budget committee—the very center and heart of the whole federation—is in Cleveland appointed by the president of the federation, subject to the approval of the trustees. In some other cities this committee is elected by the trustees, or even in part by the agencies. The Cleveland plan has worked satisfactorily because great care has been taken to appoint a committee which shall be both competent and acceptable to the agencies. While some of its members are continued from year to year to secure continuity of policy, others are changed in order to distribute the very valuable educational experience incident to this service. While the Welfare Federation through its budget committee and its affiliation with the community fund thus plays an essential part in financing the charitable agencies, its most important achievements have been in quite other directions, and especially in searching study of the local problems with which these agencies deal.

The Community Union in Detroit corresponds to the Welfare Federation of Cleveland. Like the latter it is allied with a community fund or money-raising body by an overlapping directorate and staff, a common executive, and common headquarters. There are, however, some interesting differences. The patriotic fund of the war period has changed its name to community fund but it has not been reorganized as in Cleveland. It is still in effect a self-constituted body, although with a strong sense of trusteeship. It appears to command the confidence of givers and of the agencies but it is not a delegated body. The new Philadelphia Welfare Federation may therefore rightly claim that it is following the conspicuously successful example of the Detroit Community Fund if its aim is to serve only the purpose which this collecting agency serves.

Another difference between the Cleveland and the Detroit history is that in Detroit the patriotic fund during the war definitely undertook to finance the local agencies as well as the Red Cross and other war activities. The Detroit Community Union did not make its own appeal as did the Cleveland Welfare Federation. The resemblances, however, are far more striking. In Detroit as in Cleveland the Community Union is managed by a general board or council made up of two delegates from each of the fifty-seven associations in its membership. This general council elects the officers and board of directors. The budget after approval by the budget committee is finally acted upon by the board of directors. While the community fund, both in Detroit and in Cleveland, might no doubt object to the budget submitted on behalf of the agencies of their federation, it does not in fact do so. The determination of the budget is regarded as a highly specialized and responsible function and the group which assumes responsibility for raising the combined budgets, while giving attention to the demands of the activities not in the federation, leaves to the latter the responsibility for the decisions as to the federated agencies.

Federation in Detroit is perhaps less securely established than in Cleveland. Some institutions remain outside. More individuals are hostile even to the idea. There are more independent solicitations. There are not so many who understand the advantages of federation, and the inherent difficulties to be overcome are greater. The city is larger but its industries, centering in automobile manufacture, are less balanced and stable, its social agencies are less developed. Developments comparable to those of twenty years ago in Cleveland have been taking place within the last five years. Except for the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., the denominational activities and a few meagerly supported agencies,

there was but little social work in Detroit at the time when the enormous growth of the automobile industry and the war conditions precipitated an urgent need for social control and social action. William J. Norton, the executive secretary of the Community Union, who is also the executive of the community fund, is a person of ideas, of energy and shrewd judgment of men. I am told that his caustic tongue sometimes gives offense, but he is evidently at home among men of affairs, able to hold his own in the give and take of serious discussions and to take part on equal terms in the making of decisions which affect the interests of the entire community. He was able to stand for the principle of free assembly and free speech at a time when they were jeopardized, without becoming known as a dangerous revolutionary. He is known to favor liberal policies in general even when he has to be the spokesman for groups which the average liberal would probably regard as reactionary, at least as to such matters as the open shop and collective bargaining.

In certain circles it has become customary to assume that the "drive" as a means of raising money has become unpopular—that its day is over. They do not think so in Detroit. They say that what is unpopular is multiplicity of drives and certain kinds of drives; that the intensive campaign of one week as a substitute for scores of independent appeals by separate agencies is not unpopular but on the contrary very much in favor. By accident I happened to be in Detroit on the day when the captains of divisions held their first meeting to "set up" the general plans for the campaign for 1922. The general secretary of the Y. M. C. A. was in the chair. The president of the community fund and other prominent and influential business men were among the nine persons present. Three of the nine were paid executives such as under the constitution of the Philadelphia Welfare Fed-

eration would not even be allowed to serve on its board of managers.

The question as to whether any other method than an intensive campaign or "drive" would be used was not even raised except by myself and in answer to a question I was told that there was no objection, but on the contrary entire agreement that this method was the most acceptable and the most certain to be successful.

Thorough and intelligent consideration was given to the filling of vacancies in the campaign body. What seemed to me most remarkable and encouraging was that the strongest and most successful organizers from the war period were remaining at their posts, that what changes were made were not because they were losing their best men but only or mainly in order to enlist the very best men in the city whose services had not already been fully utilized or who were now free from some other even more pressing obligation. One qualified man they were inclined not to press too hard because he was in charge of a new manufacturing enterprise which was weathering a difficult period and actually demanded all his time, but this was exceptional. The general idea was that no one was too busy or too important to be called into this common service for the week of the campaign and the fortnight or so of necessary preparation. The relation of the Red Cross roll call to the campaign of the community fund was most carefully and sympathetically considered. The president of the fund had just returned from a personal conference in Washington with the director of domestic operations. It was recognized that the fund would have to be prepared to include the supplementary demands of the Red Cross as well as its roll call and on the other hand it was realized that full advantage should be taken of the Red Cross plans and interest in the appeal and that

the available resources latent in the active Red Cross membership should be fully utilized. This is typical of the general attitude of these managers, who were thus carefully laying out their campaign seven months in advance.

Detroit has made less use than Cleveland of collections from workers in industrial plants. This is due in part, as far as the recent campaign is concerned, to the falling off in employment and the actual or prospective decrease of ability to give on the part of wage-earners. It was felt that under the circumstances it would be unfair to ask them to give, or at least to appear to bring any pressure to bear on them by the plan of plant solicitation. However the program of 1922 does not exclude the industrial appeals and whether or not they will be made will no doubt depend on the general industrial conditions in November.

The goal of the campaign of last November was $2,560,000. The direct returns before the end of the year were $2,454,000. The deficit of $106,000 for the current year will be met without serious retrenchment. No city of course has been more seriously affected by the industrial depression than Detroit. Seventy-nine factories employing two-thirds of the industrial population of Detroit had 25,000 employes in December as compared with 200,000 nine months before. In other words seven-eighths of its workers were unemployed. The Ford employes had their bonus and the Dodge employes no doubt had some savings, but the large number employed in the smaller establishments, as for example in those which make automobile accessories, often had no reserve resources. This was especially true of the Negroes who had come to Detroit from the South or more frequently from other northern cities, and of the Mexicans who had come from Mexico to work in the sugar-beet fields. As far as this became a relief problem it fell chiefly on the

Department of Public Welfare, although the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Home Service of the Red Cross, and other agencies in the Detroit community union, and the Housing Bureau of the union itself, had their burdens substantially increased. The Community Union had co-operated when the need arose with the Department of Public Welfare, for example, by supplying the services of a competent case worker, and again with the courts by supplying a probation officer. This emergency, however, was one which could be met only by an appropriation of public funds in substantial amount and the union worked with the city administration to secure action by the council. Between January 1 and June 30 the city will have expended $1,100,000 for relief and it is expected that the coming fall and winter will bring an even more serious problem of unemployment. The Department of Public Welfare in April presented a scene of emergency activity creditable to the officials and to the social workers of the city. It was of course an emergency and the methods were those appropriate to an emergency. It was amusing to find that about one-fourth of the extra workers required were recruited from the late lamented sociological department of the Ford plant. The main thing is that the mayor, a former partner in the Ford enterprise and a thoroughgoing reformer; the commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare, who is earnestly trying to square his departmental administration with the mayor's ideas; the director of the Social Service Bureau in the department, who was formerly in the Community Union; the City Council; and the managers of the Community Union, represented in this instance by our old friend Fred R. Johnson, formerly secretary of the Associated Charities of Boston—all recognized the acute character of the relief problem presented by the trade depression. They measured it, recognizing that it could be cured only by

resumption in industry but that the consequences of it should not fall too heavily on individuals; and they treated it as a community responsibility. Other cities have done this more or less. Detroit, where it fell most heavily, seems to me to have done it surprisingly well and I think this may be attributed in part to the existence of the Community Union and the underlying sense of civic responsibility which this both implies and encourages.

IV

THE NATIONAL AGENCIES: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

NATIONAL agencies for the promotion of social welfare have a common, although not altogether identical, interest in the federation movement. The very term "national agencies" covers activities which differ not only, like the local agencies, in their specific aims, but, even more widely than the local agencies, in their form of organization and its relation to their means of financial support. The American Red Cross has its annual roll call in which it desires to enlist as nearly as possible the whole body of American citizens. The National Tuberculosis Association has its seal sale, through which it desires to reach all the people in order to keep alive their interest in the crusade against the white plague. The Boy Scouts have a program in which they wish to enlist all boys of appropriate age.

The Y. M. C. A. has perhaps the hardest question to settle in connection with federation. It is national and international, but its local branches are largely autonomous. It is Protestant and evangelical but not sectarian. It is educational, recreational, and religious. Although difficult to classify, there is no doubt of its eligibility to membership in a federation of social agencies. The difficulty arises in another direction and is typical. The association has a large and loyal constituency. It has critics also, but that is another story and has nothing to do with the present one except that hostility to any one agency may sometimes be so strong as to become an appreciable factor in the general financial cam-

paign. These loyal constituents of the Y. M. C. A. provide not only current funds but new buildings and equipment. They are beginning to leave legacies. Probably the association is a beneficiary in many wills already drawn, but subject to change while the testators live. Can the Y. M. C. A. afford to see this constituency transferred to a federation of all the social agencies, secular and religious, Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic? Even if the federation furnishes the amount required for present annual needs, is there any assurance of permanency? Is there a suitable margin for growth? Is there not a certainty of loss if the intense personal loyalty to the association is merged in a more vague and diffused interest in the community? These are serious considerations. They may arise in the case of other agencies but they have in fact arisen most persistently and have found most articulate expression in the case of the association.

There are none who have seen more clearly than the general secretaries of the Y. M. C. A. in the cities which, like Cleveland and Detroit, have had most experience with joint financial campaigns, that such considerations are relics of an institutional partisanship, of a sectarian provincial view. The institution exists to foster the general good. It should defend its claims in a reasonable, fair, and public presentation, and in comparison with claims for support from other agencies which also exist for the good of society. When the institution becomes the end instead of the instrument, the final instead of the intermediate object of loyalty, devotion and enthusiasm, it defeats its end. Associations for civic, religious, and charitable purposes above all others need to keep clearly before their members that individual welfare and the common welfare are their only excuse for being. They must therefore confer together and work together in the interests of individuals and the interests of the common

good; else they will waste their resources and may even thwart other and perhaps better projects than their own. If there is a conflict of loyalties, the larger loyalty, the one which subordinates the particular institution or agency to the central idea of a high standard of life in the community as a whole, must prevail.

The National Consumers' League and the National Child Labor Committee present more simply one of the problems which will have to be faced if the local welfare federations are to continue to occupy the strong position which they have attained in a few cities and if the movement is to become general. These two and several other national associations are dealing with controversial subjects. The evils which they attack have apologists and defenders. The reforms which they advocate cannot be carried through without angry opposition. They are obliged to insist on the duty of the state to protect certain workers from practices which are profitable to individual employers, and even to parents. Their programs may run counter to the general philosophy of some very good citizens who have no selfish private interest at stake. Of course, these two bodies do not have identical programs and either or both of them may include in their activities certain objects which are generally popular. The Y. W. C. A. has also of late attracted to itself the enviable kind of hostility to which I refer and might equally be chosen to point the issue.

Are the welfare federations to regard themselves as representing only the majority sentiment in deciding which organizations are to be included in their plans for the joint raising of funds or should they make provision also for organizations which in the nature of the case would be supported only by a minority? The question may equally arise in connection with some local agencies—as it did in Cin-

cinnati during the war in connection with an Americanization house whose head worker was of foreign birth and was for this reason, in the rather absurd opinion of some possible contributors, disqualified to teach Americanization. The Council of Social Agencies after investigation held that the work of the settlement was such as to justify including it; but in the more famous case of the Social Unit, the council decided for exclusion, having ample evidence that to include it would endanger the whole campaign of the welfare agencies.

It would seem as if the only basis on which Jewish, Catholic or Protestant institutions of social welfare can be assured of permanent support in any plan of community organization is that under which all recognized forms of social work are included. If religious differences can thus be reconciled for purposes of a joint appeal for philanthropic activities—and experience has shown that this is quite possible—why should permanent unity of community endeavor be threatened by differences on economic or industrial questions? If any agencies are excluded for such reasons, they will feel compelled not only to make their appeal independently but to give as a reason for seeking independent support that the local federation, or the controlling element in it, is opposed to their program. This might from the point of view of an aggressive propagandist body become an actual asset. It might advertise their cause, and give it a hearing. From the point of view of those who believe that there is a common civic concern for the social welfare to which appeal can always be made, which needs only to be enlightened, informed, aroused, and self-directed when thus alert and informed, it would seem to be unfortunate.

Organizations that have legislative programs, and indeed all that aim to modify public opinion, have need of members, of a constituency, as well as of money. In the case of

the Red Cross the Cleveland Welfare Federation adopted the plan of enrolling all contributors in that body, considering the first dollar as given for Red Cross membership. This may have corresponded fairly well to the wishes of contributors at the time when the first joint appeal which included the Red Cross was made; but it is obviously arbitrary and indefensible whenever there are those who do not wish to belong to the Red Cross or who prefer that this particular contribution should be used for some other purpose—and it is evidently not applicable to other organizations. Some contributors give only one dollar; of five dollar gifts it is an arbitrary assignment of 20 per cent. The Cincinnati policy of encouraging designations—that is urging all contributors to specify to what agencies their gifts are to be applied and in what proportions—might solve this difficulty, provided each agency is supplied with a list of those who have thus expressed a desire to be regarded as contributing to its support, and provided contributors specify also the agencies which they do not wish to help.

An unofficial consensus of opinion on the part of the executive of a number of national, social and civic agencies is found in a circular letter which at their request was sent by the National Information Bureau in April of this year to such of the federations as are members of the bureau. This was summarized in two resolutions:

> That a proposal be made to community funds and financial federations that these funds and federations undertake to educate their citizens as to the claim of national agencies for adequate local support.
>
> That these federations be asked (a) to leave the way open to national organizations having proper claims to get their own support with the federations' cordial cooperation; or (b) to include adequate support in their own budgets for such national organizations as make application therefor.

These propositions are evidently only a starting point for discussion. They seem to indicate that the national bodies now recognize that the welfare federations must be dealt with realistically as "going concerns." They recognize the wisdom if not the necessity of making a combined approach to the federations on a basis of good faith and seeking their co-operation. They imply an expectation that the spirit of those who are managing the community fund is as national as their own; that their public spirit is not exclusively local. This is gratifying and on the whole justified, in spite of the narrowness and abuse of power by local federations in a few well established instances.

The welfare federations have thus far adopted no uniform or general policy in the matter of including the national agencies. Some support local agencies exclusively and these usually include any local branches of national agencies which function in the community where the federation exists. Some federations, while not including the support of national agencies in their appeal, have drawn upon a reserve or undesignated fund to make a contribution which would obviate the unwelcome alternative of an appeal to their contributors. Still others have considered and passed upon the appeal of certain national bodies, and included them in their campaign on the same basis as if they were local agencies. In this case the local federation has to consider of course not only the merits of the cause, but also the question as to what part of the burden of supporting it can properly be apportioned to their own citizens. Still a different question arises when an enterprise, such as a southern school for Negroes or a western Indian mission, seeks support from a federation in a distant city but does not profess to be national in any other sense.

In deciding which national or non-resident agencies to

include and for what amounts respectively, the welfare federations have naturally followed different procedures according to their own notions of propriety. They have sometimes allowed a local branch or affiliated body to include in its budget some allowance for the national body with which it is associated. They have sometimes, in the case of a national body which does not have a local branch, asked that there should be created some local group which could be held responsible for the use of funds raised by the federation and for co-operation in general. They have sometimes required that the national body should furnish evidence of local interest by first securing a certain sum of money or a list of members in the community, after which an application for inclusion in the common budget would be considered. Like the informal resolutions of the national executives, all this may be considered preliminary jockeying for position while the time for deciding on some plan for permanent co-operation is close at hand.

The National Child Labor Committee, like other agencies which see both the difficulties and the opportunities involved, has been giving this subject special attention. I quote some paragraphs from its acting membership secretary, suggesting a whole-hearted sort of co-operation which might take place between a welfare federation and a national organization which has no local chapters or committees:

> In general, our attitude toward them should be one of closest possible cooperation. The people of the city form their federation to avoid repeated appeals for money, and we should respect absolutely their attempt at efficient giving. We should approach the federations with the feeling that we can help them as well as with the hope that they will help us.
>
> It is very important, however, that we shall approach them, knowing that the time will come when the community budget system of giving will be generally accepted. We must recognize in doing this that "charity begins at home," and that our

approach to them must necessarily be one of education along the line of responsibility for nation-wide social activities.

Long before the local campaign begins we should present our case in writing to the board of directors of the federation. We should ask them for consideration when their budget is framed, and should accompany our request with a comprehensive statement of what our organization stands for, what it has accomplished and what it hopes to accomplish in the future. We should offer to send a staff representative, if necessary, to present our work and our plan for cooperating with the federation at the time of their campaign.

If we want this sort of cooperation at all we should go into it thoroughly. We should have a representative on the ground during the entire week of the drive, presenting our work with the same sort of enthusiasm and efficiency that the local organizations are using. In my estimation the most important thing in this connection is that we should closely conform with the local methods of conducting the campaign. If the federation begins the drive with a parade, each local organization providing a float, we should have some sort of float. If during the whole week each local organization is given the opportunity to exhibit its work in the window of some store, we should have some sort of display, and we should make every possible attempt to make it as attractive and as inexpensive as possible.

It seems to me the whole success of cooperation between the national organizations and local federations depends upon the contact during that week of the national social representative with the people in the local federation. If I were the staff representative I should want to do everything I possibly could to make the whole campaign successful, making speeches when called upon, working in the factories if they have an industrial day, working in the offices of the executives when necessary, and doing everything within my power to convince the local people that the national agencies are making no attempt to take from local charities what rightfully belongs there, but that they are hoping to broaden the whole scheme of business-like budget making and concentrated publicity to the extent that they can easily give a splendid appropriation to national work.

All of this would take a great deal of time, but I feel certain that the results would warrant employing a staff member whose full time, during the season when appropriations are made and campaigns are waged, should be given to this work.

John R. Shillady of the National Consumers' League has expressed the opinion that the time is ripe for an analysis of the support of national agencies both by localities, looking to a spreading of support over larger areas, and by sources, individual, federation, and foundation. Such a study might include not only social and civic bodies but also educational and religious institutions. The movement for community trusts or foundations, such as already exist in many cities as a means of consolidating legacies and other individual gifts under a permanent community trust, and the plan for a uniform public trust for charitable purposes, have already attracted the lively, not to say alarmed interest of national and international bodies which have been accustomed to receive bequests from all parts of the country. There is an intimate relation of a psychological kind between plans for consolidating bequests in a fund which will benefit the community in whatever way a representative board of trustees from time to time may think most desirable, and the federation plan, under which current activities of social agencies are financed in the general interest of the community. In both cases there is a grave danger that national and world interests may be unduly subordinated to the community interests which are thus emphasized. In both instances the remedy is for those who have the national or world view—and they are apt to be found among the leaders in the community movements—to guard against this danger. Safety is not to be found in blind opposition to community organization, of which we have too little rather than too much. The national bodies may wisely seek to sink their roots deep in the fertile soil of local neighborhood responsibility which the federation movement is cultivating and watering and clearing of tares. The inquiry which Allen T. Burns is about to undertake for the National Investigation

Bureau into the functioning of the national agencies in selected cities will give an early opportunity to open up certain aspects of their financial support.

I am fully conscious of the omissions in this series, as I bring it to a close: and, dealing with so elusive and controversial a subject, I can hardly hope even that all its sins are of that class. I have not explained, for example, why my good friend Knowlton Mixer, who became secretary of the Federated Charities in Baltimore on his return from Red Cross service in France, remained for so short a time in that position. I do not know. I am reasonably sure, however, that the explanation that he was forced out arbitrarily by the Alliance of Charitable Agencies is far too simple to fit the facts. I have not dealt with the religious complications in Worcester. I have not gone into the serious grievances of the Associated Charities of Erie, Pa., in regard to the apparently arbitrary policies of the federation and community chest in that city. It is alleged that the federation—which in Erie was formerly a combination of givers but is now a federation of social agencies, mainly of the institutional type—has attempted to interfere very seriously with the proper organization and management of the work of the Associated Charities; that the federation has issued orders which the society has refused to carry out; that the federation has directed the society to lay off workers and forbidden it to make increases in salaries; that notwithstanding increased demands for relief caused by unemployment, the society's budget, approved months before, has been decreed to be unalterable. I have had no opportunity to investigate these charges on the ground and refer to them only to say that it is to be hoped that no federation will long endure which practices such "strong-arm" methods. Whether they have prevailed in Erie or not they are conceivable and are

among the risks in any federation which assumes the financial function. The constituent bodies are not without their defenses, as the experience of Erie itself shows. Even those who find themselves in the minority, or standing alone, as exponents of ideas which they can defend, can always carry their appeal to the public. Federation creates a favorable atmosphere for entertaining such appeals.

Of the two outstanding types—a federation of givers and a federation of agencies—the latter is less likely to develop the big stick attitude; but no form of organization will afford complete security. Very much depends upon the standards and the spirit of the agencies which are federated. If their spirit is narrow and bourbon, if their morale is low, then the spirit and morale of any central body which they create—whether it be a council of social agencies or a federation exercising financial functions—will be likely to correspond. Fortunately, the managers and officers of the leading federations have been showing increasing appreciation of trained service, of adequate compensation for expert workers, of standards objectively measured and tested, of searching studies into the causes of poverty, of educational as distinct from palliative relief, of an aroused and enlightened public opinion as a constant support to the work of the social agencies. The federations should be judged by their success in attaining or approaching these and similar objectives, not alone or mainly by their success in raising money. The actual present form of organization of all the principal federations has been greatly influenced if not determined by accident—local and temporary—and it would be the height of folly for a new community to copy any such accidental features as for example the relation between the Community Union and the Community Fund in Detroit.

Dayton, O., has something to teach other cities in regard

to the technique of publicity, as might be expected of the city of the National Cash Register and the airplane. The Dayton plan contemplates a trinity: financial federation; council of social agencies; and community council. Seven labor unions have joined the Bureau of Community Service, which is the name of the federation in Dayton. It is the "newspaper," however, published at intervals to inform the people about the work of the agencies, which most completely reflects the unique Dayton spirit.

St. Paul, Minn., has a "Community Chest, Inc." which has certain merits although its form of organization is one which can hardly be recommended to other cities. The report of the joint committee of the St. Paul Association and the Central Council of Welfare Agencies which led to the creation of the Community Chest stated the problem so convincingly that subsequent reports both in Philadelphia and in Denver adopted portions of it, the latter with due acknowledgment.

In St. Paul, as in Grand Rapids, the theory is that the Community Chest should be equally representative of contributors and of the social service agencies. The theory is, however, differently applied. The St. Paul Association (chamber of commerce) elects six of thirteen managers, the social agencies six, and one is appointed by the mayor. It is not surprising that the Trades and Labor Assembly, when its president was elected to the board of managers, took up the question as to whether it should thus indirectly endorse the chest, and after an investigation by a special committee and several debates, decided by a divided vote to withhold endorsement. This meant not only that the president of the Trades and Labor Assembly must decline to serve on the board but also that the secretary should withdraw from the budget committee on which he had been serving for several

months. The merits and demerits of federation of welfare agencies and of the chest plan of raising funds did not enter as a determining factor into this decision. The reason for the attitude of labor was that several members of the chest were active in the Citizens' Alliance, which is conducting the "open shop" campaign. It would be extraordinary if a board of thirteen members, six of whom are chosen by a single commercial organization, even one as representative as the St. Paul Association, should be satisfactory to labor, especially in a time when there are such sharp conflicts of interests and views as are revealed by the present "open shop" movement. That the co-operation of labor was sought reflects credit on the managers of the chest. If it had been understood to be acting only for the agencies to be financed, the effort would have been more likely to be successful. There is no prohibition in the Articles of Incorporation against paid social workers serving on the board of directors.

The St. Paul Chest takes pride in its low administrative expenses, which for the first year amounted approximately to $40,000 or little more than a dollar apiece for its 38,000 subscribers. Its auditing department is highly developed. This embraces a regular financial audit of the various organizations for which it raises funds, following the usual excellent practice of the financial federations. But in addition, each report analyzes rather more fully than is customary the business operations of each department of the institutions, arriving at such facts as per capita costs, amounts properly chargeable to overhead, losses in revenue producing departments, etc. In nearly every agency examined, the auditors have suggested improvements, not only in accounting methods, but in business and administrative methods. This at once suggests another danger with which social workers in

administrative positions have sufficient reason to be familiar. Within their own province, auditors are most useful. When, assuming a wisdom which they do not possess, they undertake to legislate or to make executive decisions, they may become an intolerable nuisance. When the executives of the agencies assume that the auditors have such responsibilities they are either shirking their own duties or exaggerating those of the expert.

Probably the most obvious and serious of all our omissions thus far has been in reference to the Cincinnati Council of Social Agencies and its allied Community Chest, which belong in effect with Cleveland and Detroit as most fully illustrating the successful operation of the federation idea. It is appropriate to end with Cincinnati, where under the most adverse business conditions there has been brought to a close, since these articles were begun, a typical and successful campaign for $1,750,000. There are 60,000 contributors. Over six thousand volunteer workers took part in the canvass. Never before, even in war times, has the community responded more freely or with more enthusiasm than it responded to this year's appeal for the charitable work of the city and county. The Cincinnati policy of encouraging specific designations has proved its soundness and wisdom at least for that city. Practically all of the local organizations are now members of the Community Chest. All of them appear to be not only friendly but enthusiastic advocates of it. At the final rally over one thousand people—all the hotel could accommodate—met at a banquet to receive final reports of the district chairmen. Every team, to revert to war vocabulary, went over the top. The various chairmen and their workers are now perfecting a more permanent organization, having in view not only financial support for the agencies but so co-

ordinating and developing their activities as to promote the general welfare of the community.

In Cleveland, partly because of Mr. Kingsley's enthusiasm for child welfare, the federation has especially emphasized various aspects of child-caring. In Cincinnati, partly perhaps because of the preoccupation of the Social Unit with the subject while it was actively at work in the Mohawk-Brighton district, but also because of Mr. Bookman's appreciation of its importance and because of the activity of several public and voluntary local agencies, public health has been in the forefront of the advance of recent years. However, children's agencies, recreational agencies, organizations dealing with family standards of living and with the correction of bad social conditions have made perceptible progress with the enlarged resources and the more vigorous backing which the Council of Social Agencies has supplied. There is an obvious community consciousness in Cincinnati which during the last winter showed itself in a satisfactory handling of the difficult emergency presented by the lack of employment.

The Council of Social Agencies in St. Louis has appointed as its new executive Elwood Street, until now secretary of the Louisville Welfare League. The Chicago Council of Social Agencies has secured funds for a full time executive and is calling Wilfred S. Reynolds to the position. For several months Boston has had such a council with Robert Kelso as its secretary. New York alone among the larger cities is wholly without either a council or a federation; either a community fund or machinery for developing a community program.

This study has not canvassed the work of the non-financial councils in Boston, Chicago or St. Louis. The time during which any council has had an executive and staff at its disposal has been too short to permit much more than the formu-

lation of plans and ideas, and the present study has intended to report achievement rather than programs; the analysis of forms of organization has been from the point of view of their practical working. That a democratic and educational spirit is of more importance than administrative machinery is to be taken for granted; but that machinery is also worthy of consideration is evident from the recent history of welfare federations. The ultimate test of a welfare federation is not in the amount of money which it collects, nor in the number of its contributors, nor in the degree of immunity which it may give from annoying drives; but in the number of well informed and well disposed citizens whom it discovers and associates for the purpose of doing what they can to secure a good life for themselves and their neighbors.

Said of The Survey

FROM A LAWYER—I value the Survey because looking over its pages I can learn something of the law in action as it affects great masses of my fellow men and be enabled to look at the law functionally as well as analytically and historically.—ROSCOE POUND, *Dean of the Harvard Law School.*

FROM A SOCIAL WORKER—The number of people who read the Survey is to some extent an index to the social consciousness of a community. I am trying to get more readers for it in Bridgeport.—CLARENCE KING, *Secretary of the Bridgeport Financial Federation.*

FROM AN EDUCATOR—The article in the last number of Survey Graphic, The Faculty Loses the Ball, expresses admirably what has been in my mind about the big place that football takes in modern American education. That article alone is worth the whole year's subscription.—FREDERIC PERLEY JOHNSON, *Principal of the Union High School, Hayward, Calif.*

FROM A BANKER—It is a pleasure for me to renew my contribution. I enclose my check with my very best wishes for every success in your splendid enterprise.—PAUL M. WARBURG, *Chairman Board of International Acceptance Bank, New York.*

FROM A GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL—The Children's Bureau has had the very cordial cooperation of the Survey in the development of its work and in broadcasting its findings. All the members of the bureau would, I am sure, be glad to join with me in extending congratulations and best wishes for the future.—GRACE ABBOTT, *Director Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor.*

The SURVEY

twice-a-month, serves the fields of practical welfare work through a staff of trained men and women who are experienced workers as well as competent writers. It keeps its readers in touch with the new developments and the new ideas in social work and community organization in all parts of the United States with occasional excursions abroad. It is accurate, painstaking, well printed, freely illustrated. It is published by a non-commercial membership organization which does not pay—or earn—profits. Sample copies will be sent free on request.

STAFF

PAUL U. KELLOGG, *Editor*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAVEN EMERSON, M.D., *Health*
ROBERT W. BRUERE, *Industry*
JOSEPH K. HART, *Education*
GEDDES SMITH, *Communities*
NEVA R. DEARDORFF, *Social Work*
BRUNO LASKER, *Foreign Service*

THE SURVEY

112 East 19 Street, New York

3 0112 072455964